

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/603,390	HOCHENBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu Thao Havan	3691	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thu Thao Havan. (3) Joseph Ragusa.
 (2) Alexander Kalinowski. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 October 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-33.

Identification of prior art discussed: Togher (US 5,375,055).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed prior art in relation to the claims, in particular the independent claims. Applicant's representative argued the differences between the present application and Togher in relation to the limitations "mean for offering to the identified counterparty a further trade at the same price as the executed deal; and means for executing the further trade irrespective of whether or not the further trade exceeds one or both of the credit limits assigned by each of the parties to the trade to the other in place when said executed deal took place". The Examiner suggested amendments to the claims to more clearly differentiate the claimed invention from the Togher reference. If Examiner, upon further reviews, believes Togher teaches the features discussed above, the Examiner will call Applicant's representative to discuss the reference further.